



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,028	12/30/2003	Brian R. Meyers	MS304770.01 / MSFTP501US	9173
27195 7590 07/10/2008 AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			EXAMINER SHIN, KYUNG H	
			ART UNIT 2143	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 07/10/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/750,028	Applicant(s) MEYERS ET AL.	
	Examiner KYUNG H. SHIN	Art Unit 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 3, 5, 11, 13 - 19, 26 - 32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 3, 5, 11, 13 - 19, 26 - 32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. This application was filed on 12-30-2003. Claims 1 - 3, 5, 11, 13 - 19, 26 - 32 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 11, 13, 14, 15 have been amended. Claims 4, 6 - 10, 12, 20 - 25, 33 - 40 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 13, 26, 32 are independent.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities:

2.1 Claim 5 is dependent on Claim 4 which has been canceled. Examiner interpreted Claim 5 as dependent on Claim 1 for this action.

2.2 Claim 1 is amended due to **35 USC § 101** issue from last Non-Final rejection. Examiner recommends modifying line 7 of claim 1, "automatically ~~facilitates controls~~ of the remote system by the user..." Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-5, 9-11, 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to **non-statutory** subject matter. Amended claims with "computer-implemented system." don't meet the conditions of 101 requirements, thus **35 USC § 101 rejection is maintained.**

In Claims 1, "a device comprising a local agent **component..**" is to be construed as computing device of *software per se*, *unless* agent component

makes clear in specification that the only reasonable interpretation of the word "component" is limited to hardware inclusive, tangible, embodiment. It is possible for the corresponding disclosed "component" to cover an embodiment of software alone. (spec. para 32).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 4/8/2008 have been fully considered but they are moot due to new grounds of rejection.

3.1 Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose, "Panasyuk merely describes incorporating windows from remote desktop environments into a local desktop environment via a local node, a local agent, a first remote node, and a first remote agent", and "Panasyuk fails disclose aspects of applicants' claim invention". (Remarks Page 11)

Panasyuk discloses that commands input to the remote desktop displayed on the local desktop are echoed to the actual remote desktop as if input locally on the remote desktop. Any command input into a desktop window performs an action such as editing a document; or initiation of execution of a program. The commands input on the local desktop and echoed on the remote desktop are actions (such as commands) actually performed on the remote desktop system. The desktop is actually a user interface that is updated as the user inputs commands via input devices such as a keyboard, a mouse, or a touch screen. The desktop performs these commands and the results are displayed on the desktop display (whether desktop is a local or a remote

Art Unit: 2154

display)

3.2 Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose, “emulation of a touch pad interface on the local system to control the remote system”. (Remarks Page 14)

Panasyuk discloses wherein interface on the local system to control the remote system, and Deshpande discloses a touch screen or equivalent touch pad interface. (Deshpande col 1, ll 23-27: touch screen)

3.3 Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose, routing the clipboard data to the second computing system in response to a routing signal”, and of clipboard data”, and “automatically routing clipboard content from the first system to the at least a second system, the at least a second system including a second agent that verifies that the clipboard content can be received at the at least a second system”. (Remarks Page 14-15)

Beged-Dov discloses the routing of clipboard data between network-connected systems. Beged-Dov discloses user authentication before access to clipboard data transfers. The internet clipboard service is an intermediate transfer system. There is nothing in the claimed invention that discourages or discredits the usage of an intermediate system. Therefore, Beged-Dov does not teach away from the routing of clipboard data between network connected systems.

The final result is the transfer of clipboard data between two network connected systems as per claimed invention. Beged-Dov also discloses authentication of the user

Art Unit: 2154

before usage of the network capable clipboard service. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: paste function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 30-33: verifies user identity at copy system (first system); col 5, ll 17-18: verifies user identity at paste system (second system))

3.4 Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose, "the local agent of the local system is communicatively coupled to an associations database comprising associations information between a user, the local system, and the remote system". (Remarks 11-12)

Panasyuk and Kawamura disclose a database of information concerning the platform (local, remote systems) and the users. (Kawamura col 6, l 65 - col 7, l 6: information stored in agent profile (agent attributes); information with regard to whether individual platforms are capable of accepting and activating an agent; col 32, ll 23-31: storage of platform profile and agent profile; can be stored in a centralized or distributed manner (agent profile for each agent is part of each agent or in a central store))

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims **1 - 3, 5, 13 - 17, 19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being

Art Unit: 2154

unpatentable over **Panasyuk et al.** (US Patent No. **6,437,803**) in view of **Kawamura et al.** (US Patent No. **6,662,207**).

Regarding Claim 1, Panasyuk discloses a computer-implemented system that facilitates controlling a computing device, comprising a local agent component that receives local input device data of one or more local input devices of a local system and routes the local input device data to a remote system for the control thereof with the one or more local input devices such that the local system automatically facilitates control of the remote system by the user via the local agent upon deployment of the remote system proximate to the local system. (Panasyuk col 1, ll 61-63: local agent, remote agent; col 2, ll 4-7: local agent transmits to remote agent messages indicating changes in the remote display within local desktop environment; col 10, ll 30-39: software program; computer implemented method)

Panasyuk does not explicitly disclose that the local agent is communicatively coupled to an associations database comprising associations information between a user, the local system, and the remote system. However, Kawamura discloses wherein the local agent of the local system is communicatively coupled to an associations database comprising associations information between a user, the local system, and the remote system. (Kawamura col 6, l 65 - col 7, l 6: information stored in agent profile (agent attributes); information with regard to whether individual platforms are capable of accepting and activating an agent; col 32, ll 23-31: storage of platform profile and agent profile; can be stored in a centralized or distributed manner (agent profile for each agent

is part of each agent or in a central store))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk where the local agent of the local system is communicatively coupled to an associations database comprising associations information between a user, the local system, and the remote system as taught by Kawamura. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Kawamura in order to perform highly efficient information processing that is responsive to changes in situation. (see Kawamura col 6, ll 36-43: “ ... *Therefore, an object of the present invention is to provide an agent system that, when it is necessary for an agent to perform some task at another node, is capable of dynamically judging at that point, based on the situations at that time, whether to move the agent or have the agent cooperate. Given such an agent system, it is possible to perform highly efficient information processing that is responsive to changes in situation. ...* ”)

Regarding Claim 2, Panasyuk discloses the computer-implemented system of claim 1, the agent component further receives remote system data associated with the remote system that is processed to determine whether to route the local input device data to the remote system. (Panasyuk col 1, ll 61-63: local agent, remote agent; col 1, l 66 - col 2, l 7: remote agent transmits to local agent messages indicating changes for remote system to be incorporated into remote display within the local desktop environment; col. 2, lines 22-29: changes in local desktop transmitted to remote agent, changes in remote desktop transmitted to local agent; col 10, ll 30-39: software program; computer

Art Unit: 2154

implemented method)

Regarding Claim 3, Panasyuk discloses the computer-implemented system of claim 1, the local input device data is used by the remote system along with remote input device data of one or more remote input devices to facilitate control of the remote system, using at least one of the one or more local input devices, the one or more remote input devices, and a combination of one or more of the local and remote input devices.

(Panasyuk col 1, ll 61-63: remote agent; col 1, l 61 - 2, l 4: remote agent input (changes) transmitted to local agent and incorporated into local display of remote desktop; col 2, ll 4-7: local desktop input (changes) incorporated into local display of remote desktop and transmitted to remote agent col 10, ll 30-39: software program; computer implemented method)

Regarding Claim 5, Panasyuk discloses the computer-implemented system of claim 1, the remote agent component signals the local agent component, in response to which the local agent component disengages control of the remote system via the one or more local input devices by routing the local input device data for processing only by the local system. (Panasyuk col 6, l 67 - col 7, l 6: seamless windowing mode is terminated, client node switched back to desktop environment without incorporating windows from other desktop environments)

Claim 5 is assumed to be dependent on claim 1 (claim 4 has been deleted).

Regarding Claim 13, Panasyuk discloses a computer-implemented system that facilitates control of a second computing system with a first computing system, comprising:

- a) a first agent of the first computing system that receives local input device data of a local input device; (Panasyuk col 1, ll 61-63: local agent; col 2, l 4: local agent monitor local desktop) and
- b) a second agent of the second computing system that communicates with the first agent to facilitate control of the second computing system, the local input device triggers routing of the local input device data by the first agent to the second agent. (Panasyuk col 1, ll 61-63: remote agents; col 2, ll 4-7: local agent transmits local input (changes to local desktop environment) to remote agent)

Regarding Claim 14, Panasyuk discloses the computer-implemented system of claim 13, the first agent routes the local input device data based upon a location of a pointer associated with at least one of the first computing system and the second computing system, the pointer location coinciding with switching area of a user interface that triggers the first agent to route the input device data. (Panasyuk col 4, ll 30-39: window with focus on local desktop determines which system is in control, if focus window is remote desktop window the local agent transmits messages to remote system)

Regarding Claim 15, Panasyuk discloses the computer-implemented system of claim 14, the switching area is determined manually by a user that configures the physical

Art Unit: 2154

orientation of the second computing system to the first computing system, in response to which at least one of the switching area is determined on a display of the first computing system and second switching area is determined on a display of the second computing system. (Panasyuk col 4, ll 30-39: window with focus on local desktop determines which system is in control, if focus window is remote desktop window the local agent transmits messages to remote system)

Regarding Claim 16, Panasyuk discloses the computer-implemented system of claim 14, the switching area is determined automatically by automatically determining the physical orientation of the second computing system to the first computing system, in response to which the first agent determines placement of the switching area on a display of the first computing system. (Panasyuk col 4, ll 30-39: window with focus on local desktop determines which system is in control, if focus window is remote desktop window the local agent transmits messages to remote system)

Regarding Claim 17, Panasyuk discloses the computer-implemented system of claim 13, the first agent routes the local input device data based upon location of a pointer associated with a remote input device of the second computing system, the pointer location matching a location of a display element of the second computing system that triggers the second agent to signal the first agent to route the input device data to the first computing local system only. (Panasyuk col 4, ll 30-39: window with focus on local desktop determines which system is in control, if focus window is remote desktop

window the local agent transmits messages to remote system)

Regarding Claim 19, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 13, the first agent of the first computing system is coupled to a database of associations between a user, the first computing system, and the second computing system such that deployment of the second computing system proximate the first computing system automatically facilitates control of the second computing system by the user via the first computing system. (Panasyuk col 1, ll 54-61: remote display within or proximate to local desktop environment, local agent monitors and transmits to remote agent changes in remote display)

5. Claim **11** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Panasyuk-Kawamura** and further in view of **Deshpande** (US Patent No. **7,171,444**).

Regarding Claim 11, Panasyuk discloses the system of claim 1, the local agent component facilitates an interface on the local system to control the remote system. (Panasyuk col 1, ll 59-61: local desktop displays remote system; col 2, ll 1-6: local desktop transmits and receives message to control remote system) Panasyuk does not explicitly disclose a touch pad interface. However, Deshpande discloses emulation of a touch pad interface. (Deshpande col 1, ll 23-27: touch screen)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk to use a touch pad interface as taught by Deshpande. One of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 2154

would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Deshpande in order to provide adequate playback by eliminating bandwidth constraints. (Deshpande col 2, ll 42-47: “
... Many thin client systems fail to achieve adequate playback due to the bandwidth constraints and the way in which that bandwidth is used. The present invention addresses this and other problems associated with the prior art. ...”)

6. Claims **18, 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Panasyuk-Kawamura** and further in view of **Beged-Dov et al.** (US Patent No. **6,983,328**).

Regarding Claim 18, Panasyuk discloses the computer-implemented system of claim 13, the first agent facilitates copying data from the first computing system to the second computing system by encapsulating data and transmitting the encapsulated data to the second agent. (Panasyuk col 2, ll 4-7: local agent transmits messages to remote agent) Panasyuk does not explicitly disclose copying of clipboard data from the first computing system to the second computing system. However, Beged-Dov discloses copying of clipboard data from the first computing system to the second computing system by encapsulating the clipboard data and transmitting the encapsulated clipboard data, verifies that the clipboard data can be copied to the second computing system. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 30-33: verifies user identity at copy system (first system); col 5,

II 17-18: verifies user identity at paste system (second system))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk to copy clipboard data from the first computing system to the second computing system as taught by Beged-Dov. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, II 19-20; col 2, II 4-6)

Regarding Claim 32, Panasyuk discloses a system that facilitates controlling a computing system, comprising:

- a) means for providing an agent for a first system, which agent receives input device data of one or more input devices of the first system; (Panasyuk col 2, II 4-7: local agent transmits to remote agent changes; col 10, lines 30-39: program)
- c) means for signaling the agent to route the input device data to at least a second system; (Panasyuk col 3, II 42-49: agents monitor desktop environment for changes)
- d) means for routing the input device data to the second system for processing; (Panasyuk col 2, II 4-7: local agent transmits messages to remote agent indicating changes in remote system; col 10, lines 30-39: program)
- e) means for presenting objects displayed by the second system, on a display of the first system; (Panasyuk col 1, II 59-61: remote desktop incorporated into a local desktop environment; col 10, lines 30-39: program)
- f) means for controlling the second system via the display of the first system.

(Panasyuk col 2, ll 4-7: local agent transmits messages to remote agent indicating changes in remote desktop in local desktop environment; col 10, lines 30-39: program)

Panasyuk discloses wherein a user thereof to automatically facilitate control of the second system via the first system upon deployment of the second system proximate to the first system. (Panasyuk col 1, ll 59-61: local desktop displays remote system; col 2, ll 1-6: local desktop transmits and receives message to control remote system) Panasyuk does not explicitly disclose that the local agent is communicatively coupled to an associations database comprising associations information between a user, the local system, and the remote system

However, Kawamura discloses:

b) means for accessing a database of associations between the first system, at least a second system; (Kawamura col 6, l 65 - col 7, l 6: information stored in agent profile (agent attributes); information with regard to whether individual platforms are capable of accepting and activating an agent; col 32, ll 23-31: storage of platform profile and agent profile; can be stored in a centralized or distributed manner (agent profile for each agent is part of each agent or in a central store))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk where the local agent of the local system is communicatively coupled to an associations database comprising associations information between a user, the local system, and the remote system as taught by Kawamura. One of ordinary skill

in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Kawamura in order to perform highly efficient information processing that is responsive to changes in situation. (see Kawamura col 6, ll 36-43)

Panasyuk does not explicitly disclose automatically routing clipboard content from the first system to the at least a second system, the second system including a second agent that verifies that the clipboard content can be received at the second system.

However, Beged-Dov discloses:

g) means for automatically routing clipboard content from the first system to the at least a second system, the at least a second system including a second agent that verifies that the clipboard content can be received at the at least a second system. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 30-33: verifies user identity at copy system (first system); col 5, ll 17-18: verifies user identity at paste system (second system))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk to receiving clipboard data and switching clipboard data to a second computing system as taught by Beged-Dov. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, ll 19-20; col 2, ll 4-6)

7. Claims **26 - 31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Panasyuk** in view of **Beged-Dov**.

Regarding Claim 26, Panasyuk discloses a method for controlling a computer, the method comprising: receiving at least one of input device data and associated with a first agent of a first computing system Panasyuk col 2, I 4: local agent monitors local desktop); and switching at least one of the input device data to a second computing system based upon the input device data. (Panasyuk col 2, II 4-7: local agent transmits messages to remote agent indicating changes in local desktop) Panasyuk does not explicitly disclose receiving clipboard data and switching clipboard data to a second computing system. However, Beged-Dov discloses receiving clipboard data and switching clipboard data to a second computing system; and routing the clipboard data to the second computing system in response to a routine signal. (Beged-Dov col 3 I 63 - col 4, I 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, II 39-50: copy function; col 5, II 36-49: past function; col 3 I 63 - col 4, I 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk to receiving clipboard data and switching clipboard data to a second computing system as taught by Beged-Dov. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, II 19-20; col 2, II 4-6)

Regarding Claim 27, Panasyuk discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising a display of the first computing system to facilitate control of the second computing system. (Panasyuk col 1, ll 59-61: incorporate windows of a remote desktop environment into a local desktop environment for control of remote desktop) Panasyuk does not explicitly disclose a touch pad. However, Deshpande discloses a touch pad. (Deshpande col 1, ll 23-27: touch screen)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk to use a touch pad as taught by Deshpande. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Deshpande in order to provide adequate playback by eliminating bandwidth constraints. (Deshpande col 2, ll 42-47)

Regarding Claim 28, Panasyuk discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising tracking a location of the second computing system such that placement of the second computing system proximate to the first computing system causes the first agent to automatically facilitate control of the second system. (Panasyuk col 1, ll 54-61: remote display within or proximate to local desktop environment, local agent monitors and transmits to remote agent changes in remote display)

Regarding Claim 29, Panasyuk discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising configuring the first agent by designating one or more locations on a display screen of the first computing system to trigger routing of the input device data to the second system, the one or more locations include at least one of a display element and an icon

Art Unit: 2154

that are associated with triggering the first agent to route the input device data to the second computing system. (Panasyuk col 4, ll 30-39: window with focus on local desktop determines which system is in control, if focus window is remote desktop window the local agent transmits messages to remote system)

Regarding Claim 30, Panasyuk discloses the method of claim 26, (Panasyuk col 4, ll 35-37: focus location is a display window or display element; col 3, ll 15-18: windows graphical user interface implies an icon) Panasyuk does not explicitly disclose the routing of the clipboard data includes encapsulating the clipboard data and transmitting the encapsulated clipboard data to the second computing system. However, Beged-Dov discloses wherein the routing of the clipboard data includes encapsulating the clipboard data and transmitting the encapsulated clipboard data to the second computing system. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk to receiving clipboard data and switching clipboard data to a second computing system as taught by Beged-Dov. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, ll 19-20; col 2, ll 4-6)

Regarding Claim 31, Panasyuk discloses the method of claim 26. (Panasyuk col 1, ll

Art Unit: 2154

59-61: incorporate windows of a remote desktop environment into a local desktop environment for control of remote desktop) Panasyuk does not explicitly disclose authenticating the second computing system before routing the clipboard data thereto. However, Beged-Dov discloses wherein further comprising authenticating the second computing system before routing the clipboard data thereto, wherein authentication and routing are performed one of automatically and manually. (Beged-Dov col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 39-50: copy function; col 5, ll 36-49: past function; col 3 l 63 - col 4, l 2: using a clipboard for copy and paste; col 4, ll 30-33: verifies user identity at copy system (first system); col 5, ll 17-18: verifies user identity at paste system (second system))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Panasyuk to receiving clipboard data and switching clipboard data to a second computing system as taught by Beged-Dov. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Beged-Dov in order for a method and system to facilitate the efficient and secure transfer of resources. (Beged-Dov col 1, ll 19-20; col 2, ll 4-6)

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2154

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KYUNG H. SHIN whose telephone number is (571) 272-3920. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. FLYNN can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyung Hye Shin
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

KHS
July 2, 2008

/Nathan J. Flynn/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2154